## REMARKS

Claims 24 and 27-49 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 24, 27, 38 and 39 are amended. No new matter has been added. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

Applicants appreciate the courtesies extended by Examiner Mehrpour to Applicants' representative in scheduling a personal interview for September 13, 2005.

Claims 24, 27-33, 35-45 and 47-49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 6,522,421 to Chapman et al. ("Chapman") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,223,029 to Stenman et al. ("Stenman"). The rejection is respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons.

Page 3 of the Office Action asserts that col. 3, lines 35-37 of Chapman discloses storing image information in a memory, as recited in independent claim 24, and a memory in which the image information is stored, as recited in independent claim 38. Col. 3, lines 35-37 of Chapman, however, fails to disclose such features, because col. 3, lines 35-37 of Chapman states that "A program stored in memory in the printer for detecting embedded email information is provided in the appendix." Thus, the identified portion of Chapman discloses that a program for detecting embedded email information may be stored in a memory.

Chapman fails, however, to disclose storing image information in memory and/or a memory for storing image information, as respectively recited in independent claims 24 and 38, because the program is not image information. For at least these reasons, Chapman fails to disclose or suggest, *inter alia*, storing the image information in a memory and receiving an instruction to print the image information from a cellular phone after storing the image information in the memory, as recited in amended claim 24. Chapman also fails to disclose or suggest, *inter alia*, a communication unit that transmits an instruction to the image forming

device after the image information is stored in the memory of the image forming device, as recited in amended claim 38.

Page 3 of the Office Action states that col. 3, lines 33-37 and col. 4, lines 2-18 of Chapman discloses outputting a signal indicating that the image information is stored in memory. As discussed above, however, col. 3, lines 33-37 of Chapman discloses that a program for detecting embedded email information may be stored in a memory in the printer. Col. 4, lines 2-18 discloses that when the data in input form the server 30 to the RIP, the ROP strips the embedded email address information and the RIP provides status information relative to the raster image processing of the document such as PDL errors and outputs the email address and the status information to a message store agent in the printer. Chapman fails to disclose outputting a signal indicating that the image information is stored in memory.

For at least these reasons, with regard to dependent claims 27 and 39, Applicants further submit that Chapman and Stenman fail to disclose or suggest, *inter alia,* outputting, after storing the image information in the memory, to the cellular phone a signal indicating that the image information is stored in the memory, wherein the instruction to print the image information is received from the cellular phone after the signal is outputted, as recited in claim 27 and/or a printing system, wherein the image forming device includes an output unit that outputs a signal to the cellular phone after the image information is stored in the memory, and the communication unit transmits the instruction to the image forming device after receiving the signal output from the output unit of the image forming device, as recited in claim 39.

For at least these reasons, Applicants submit that the combination of Chapman and Stenman fails to disclose or suggest all the features of claims 24, 27, 38 and 39, as well as all the features of claims 28-33, 35-37, 40-45 and 47-49, which depend therefrom. It is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 34 and 46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Chapman in view of Stenman and further in view of International Patent Publication WO 94/26059 ("WO'059"). The rejection is respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons.

Applicants submit that WO'059 fails to overcome the deficiencies of the combination of Chapman and Stenman as discussed above with regard to independent claims 27 and 39, from which claims 34 and 46 depend. For at least these reasons, Applicants submit that the combination of Chapman, Stenman and WO'059 fails to disclose or suggest all the features of claims 34 and 46. It is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of all claims are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,

James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Maryam M. Ipakchi
Registration No. 51,835

JAO:MMI/ccs

Attachment:
Petition for Extension of Time

Date: August 31, 2005

**OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC**
**P.O. Box 19928**
**Alexandria, Virginia 22320**
**Telephone: (703) 836-6400**

DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE
AUTHORIZATION
Please grant any extension
necessary for entry;
Charge any fee due to our
Deposit Account No. 15-0461